

The Position and Perspectives of Cultural and Creative Industries in Southeastern Europe

Jaka Primorac*

SUMMARY

The article analyzes the current position and perspectives of cultural and creative industries in Southeastern Europe (SEE) in context of development of public policies. The proposition that SEE entered the post-transitional phase that includes an opening of the region and a creation of new cultural identities is tested through a desk research analysis of available research studies, reports and secondary data on cultural and creative industries in Southeastern Europe (SEE). The influence of imported models of cultural and creative industries is reviewed in parallel with an in-view of the global cultural and creative industries on the local production and distribution where their influence on the infrastructural as well as content level is taken into account. The article also highlights the lack of cultural and other public policies in the field of cultural and creative industries throughout the region - if they are present they are not attuned to the local situation. The analysis of the factors that, on the macro level, hinder development of cultural and creative industries is provided with the emphasis on the obstacles on the level of cultural as well as information and communication (ICT) infrastructure, educational level, as well as on the level of work and employment insecurity. The article shows how the situation in the region is still very diverse and that the conditions for the further enhancement of cultural and creative industries are still not developed. Taking into account the heterogenic situation throughout the SEE region the author outlines the necessity for the locally-founded policies

* Jaka Primorac, Znanstvena suradnica, Institut za razvoj i međunarodne odnose, Lj. F. Vukotinovića 2, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska; Jaka Primorac Ph.D., Research Associate, Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), Lj. F. Vukotinovića 2, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia; e-mail: jaka@irmo.hr

for cultural and creative industries that would be created within the framework of strategies for sustainable cultural development.

Key words: creative industries, creative labour, cultural industries, cultural policies, cultural transition, public policies, Southeastern Europe (SEE).

Introduction

Over the last twenty years, cultural and creative industries have been much discussed and debated in cultural policy research. The range of issues researched span from articles and studies dealing with the issues of instrumentalization of culture and creativity for the purposes of the cultural and creative industries development (Virno, 2002; Mayerhofer and Mokre, 2007), through studies that tackle the problems of how promotion of cultural and creative industries hides the true nature of the flexible cultural worker who functions in inadequate conditions (Ross, 2007, 2008; McRobbie, 2002). Furthermore, studies like Gill and Pratt's (2008) investigate how cultural and creative industries are used as a tool for simple solutions for deeper social problems while at the same time creating new ones (i.e. gentrification), towards those that show how the usage of concepts of cultural and creative industries is not adequate for specific social contexts (Ross, 2007; O'Connor, 2005). In this article we will follow Hesmondhalgh's distinction between cultural and creative industries where their policy and theory share 'an emphasis on the specific dynamics of making profit from the production and dissemination of primarily symbolic goods' (Hesmondhalgh, 2008: 567). Hesmondhalgh also highlights that unlike policy and theory of cultural industries, the creative industries' policy and theory work with sometimes dubiously broad definitions of the term 'creativity' and that they do not take questions of inequality and exploitation into account.

In Europe, but also globally, many studies have been prepared in order to 'measure the impact' or 'map the contribution' of cultural and creative industries, either on the national, regional or local levels. However, in contrast to the body of literature that documents strategies for regeneration adopted throughout Europe, there has been limited comprehensive analysis of this area of cultural policies (as well as of other public policies) in selected countries of Southeastern Europe (SEE). This article seeks to help remedy this situation and to identify what is at stake when we discuss cultural and creative industries in Southeastern Europe. Are we talking about a whole new model of the development of cultural and creative industries, or a continuation of the existing EU deliberations? In order to try to answer these questions, for our research purposes we will be using the concept of 'mixed societies' proposed by

Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić (2005) in order to define the context of the research in the development of cultural and creative industries in this region. Continuing on their previous work we will analyse the situation in the region and question the conditions in which cultural and creative industries are being developed. In order to carry out such a macro-level exercise we base our approach on desk research concentrated on the comprehensive review of the existing literature on the subject, together with the analysis of the available research reports and studies and on the analysis of secondary data from different sources (i.e. statistical reports, data, etc.).

Concerning the usage of the concept of Southeastern Europe¹ one can say that it is highly contested on historical and political grounds; this region is also referred to as the (Western and/or Eastern) Balkans – a term that primarily delineates the historical and cultural space they inhabit. Southeastern Europe as a concept also carries historical and cultural meaning, which makes SEE and Balkans here complimentary terms. To choose one over the other implies a series of delicate choices; both terms have their, as Todorova (1997: 184) would say, ‘powerful ontology’. However, the concept of SEE is deemed as more open and general as Švob-Đokić notes (2001: 41) making it appropriate against the background of the countries’ integration into the European Union.² Although these countries have been viewed as a region throughout the years, Southeastern Europe was never actually constituted as a true entity (Švob-Đokić, Primorac, Jurlin, 2008: 184). What is more, the SEE is a rather differentiated whole with many differences not only between the countries themselves, but also with much diversity within the countries as well, where the main foci of cultural and creative industries remain the capital cities. Thus, on the macro level we will try to outline the similarities in this ‘entity’ we label as the SEE region, and we will examine the differences that can be outlined and which are relevant for the cultural and creative industries development.

In relation to the notion of the ‘SEE region’ as an ‘entity’, there are numerous hindrances: if one takes a look at the level of cultural communication it should be mentioned that both the international and regional cultural communication is relatively weak and that it mainly develops along the project-to-project basis. As Obuljen (2001: 52) pointed out, due to different political systems, economic circumstances, as well as because of difficulties in transport and travel, the intercultural communication in the region was relatively low. This is still very much present and it can be said that even the cultural communication that existed between the countries in the past has in the last twenty years decreased to a minimum. In addition, if one discusses the specific situation of ex-Yugoslavia then one has to bear in mind that the cultural communication that existed before the war was stopped abruptly and that it is only now beginning to be more developed. Thus the inten-

sification of the 'regional approach' is taken from 'outside' through the programs of the Council of Europe, EU programs and initiatives (such as MEDIA, Culture, Eurimages), UNESCO, and other international organizations and foundations such as Pro Helvetia, Open Society Institute, European Cultural Foundation, etc. This is also especially evident in the cultural and creative industries field as well, as it will be shown later on. After this push from the 'outside' it can be said that this cultural networking is currently strengthening, and with it the exchange of artists and of selected programmes, projects and cultural goods and services.

'Mixed societies' of Southeastern Europe

In Southeastern Europe the beginning of cultural industrialization was evident in the socialist period, but its true growth begun with the fall of socialism and with the development of different varieties of 'capitalisms' in these countries. In particular, the industrialization of cultural field implied a reshaping of the models of production, distribution and consumption. This 'cultural transition' also implied the incorporation of SEE cultures in the global cultural flows. These changes included a re-definition of cultural institutions, (trans)formation of (new) cultural infrastructure, transformation of cultural work (e.g. changes in the work rights and obligations, work processes, etc.), changes in cultural legislation, in cultural financing models, and of a general approach to culture. When discussing the complexity of the transition processes one has to mention that the parallel processes of continuity and discontinuity of the former systems have to be taken into account (Kalanj, 1998; Županov, 2002). As stressed by Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić (2007: 883), 'Continuity with the former period is shown in the way that financing of culture is viewed as "consumption" and not as investment in production resources, as is the case with societies that have processes of postindustrial modernization underway'. Thus, in Southeastern Europe one part of modernization processes (and here one primarily thinks of industrialization processes) occurred during socialism which presented a *historical aberration* (Kalanj, 1994: 133). In this context one can speak of societies in Southeastern Europe as 'mixed societies' (Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić, 2005), where the processes of the first and second modernity are intertwined:

In terms of their social structure, the transitional societies are at best 'mixed societies', simultaneously undergoing modernization processes engendering both 'first' and (to a significantly lesser extent) 'second' modernity phenomena. What's more, even this limited extent of 'second modernity' configurations can be said to be present only in selected locations, and certainly not universally across the region (Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić, 2005: 18).

The first and second modernity are in an intertwined relationship where the latter continually questions, 'reflects' the former. However, what distinguishes 'mixed societies' of SEE from those described by Beck (2001) is their different levels of complexity and the above-mentioned conditions of this historical aberration. As one part of the modernization processes occurred during the socialist period, this thus presents the different developmental framework for the cultural and creative industries in comparison to their 'Western' or to say 'Northern' counterparts.

In the countries of Southeastern Europe, like in all post-socialist societies, globalization manifests itself as transition and social transformation (Švob-Đokić, 2005). Here the *structural transition*, that is, the transition from nation states and national economies towards a global economy, has to be distinguished from the *systemic transition* – the transition from systems of socialism(s) to capitalism(s). Most of the research on the transition processes so far has concentrated on the political and economic changes, but less attention has been paid to the changes in the cultural field. In this sense, cultural transition encompasses processes of social changes in the field of culture that result in the restructuring of cultural values: 'radical changes in cultural creation and cultural production; in organization of cultural activities and general cultural infrastructure, in changes of cultural institutions and in the stimulation of changes of cultural values and cultural identities' (Švob-Đokić, 2008: 37). Thus, when discussing cultural transition the changes present are multidimensional, they occur on the three following levels: the organizational level, the level of values and the symbolical level (Cvjetičanin and Katunarić, 1998: 250). The intertwining of continuity and discontinuity that is characteristic of transition processes contributes to what some authors describe as *cultural dualism* (Krzysztofek, 1996: 67) that implies the parallelism of two value systems – one arguing for an establishment of a cultural market and the other demanding the government support of the financing of culture.

It should be stressed that most of the cultural changes that occurred in the region of Southeastern Europe are connected to general structural and systemic changes of the societies in question, and to an overall transitional political and economic restructuring. These *turbulent times* brought into question the status of the cultural 'subsystem', as Dragičević-Šešić and Dragojević (2005) stressed. The authors emphasise the factors leading to instability of the environment that were the outcome of the following occurrences: the crises of public policies and the public sector, the underdevelopment of the relationships between the public, private and civil sectors, the crises of positions of institutions and their role in society, the crises of participation and of cultural market (Dragičević-Šešić and Dragojević, 2005: 26-27). But it has to be noted that not all countries went through the crisis in the same way: 'The nature and depth of the crisis varied across the region, particularly as concerns

the preservation and transformation of the cultural system' (Dragičević-Šešić and Dragojević, 2005: 30). In the last few years the recession contributed to further deepening of these problems throughout the region.

In this way a change occurred in the region of Southeastern Europe: culture is not anymore 'viewed as a burden on the budget or as a symbolic décor of political power' (Cvjetičanin and Katunarić, 1998: 247). Culture started to be more and more viewed through the different initiatives and creative accomplishments in cultural and creative industries as well. Hereby the influence of new information and communication technologies on the production, distribution and consumption of cultural goods and services also became stronger every day. Individual cultural practices and participation in the creation and consumption of cultural content have also become more important. What is more, the rise of these different individual initiatives is evident in the increasing input in the work of the NGO sector in culture as well. Different forms of cultural production ask for different types of financing, management and development, whereas this change is not present to an adequate extent. Hence the cultural policies have started to be approached in an intersectorial way, where *project* approach becomes the predominant model, unlike the model dominant in the past where the *institution* was at the centre (Dragičević-Šešić and Dragojević, 2005: 23-24). However, lately the project-based approach has also shown its negative sides as well mainly as a result of the instability of financing in systems where there is no tradition of support for cultural and creative sectors from the private sector and/or where the economies are fragile.

The processes of cultural transition are mostly visible on the level of cultural and creative industries since they were the first to be influenced by the 'turbulent circumstances' on the organizational and on the symbolical level. The changes did not occur universally across the region. As an example of some of these changes on the organizational level, one can highlight the following transformation of (cultural) infrastructure in the publishing and film industries: the distribution was stopped and the new one was starting to be established or did not function fully³. On the symbolical level one has to notice the move from the promotion of the representative culture of the (then) new 'elites', towards an acceptance of the products of the global cultural and creative industries, and opening towards the products of local cultural and creative industries. In this context, as it can be seen from the review of countries' cultural policies⁴ - the public policies towards cultural and creative industries in these countries are minimal. It is interesting to note that the major initiatives in the field of cultural and creative industries came from abroad, mainly as the programs supported by the British Council, and lately with the support of the UNESCO International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD).⁵ It can be said that in

countries of SEE the notion of 'cultural and creative industries' has not been welcomed without scepticism – the situation is somewhat similar to the one described by O'Connor (2005: 45).⁶ Thus we are mainly talking about imports of the concept, since there has rarely been a locally developed initiative that has taken into account the specificities of the local conditions in order to develop this sector.

On the macro level the important characteristic of the cultural and creative industries in the local regional context is that they are still relatively weakly developed; they are mainly small-scale, artisan and craft-related, which is especially evident on the local level (Švob-Đokić, 2002: 126). According to data provided by Jurin (2008: 130-131), the input of cultural and creative industries in employment in the countries of Southeastern Europe is on similar level in Croatia, Bulgaria and Romania (for year 2004 - 8.4%, 9.2% and 8.4% respectively), while in Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro it was lower in the same year (4.7%, 6.6%, and 6.9% respectively).⁷ It can be said that some of the common problems of the cultural and creative industries in Southeastern Europe are the problems of small markets, the production in small series and the heavy influence of international cultural and creative industries, as well as the problems with the distribution of products (Primorac, 2004: 73).

Therefore, it should be stressed that, like their counterparts on the level of European Union (KEA, 2006), and the European Commission (2011c: 5), the cultural and creative industries in SEE involve mainly small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and micro enterprises. In addition, there are differences between cultural and creative industries involved (e.g. between the companies of the publishing industry and those of the advertising industry) which have diverse problems and different approaches to their development. The key division on the policy instruments' level that can be deciphered is between those who receive *support from the state* (such as film, book and - to some extent - music industry) and those creative industries which are *in the marketplace* (such as design, advertising, architecture, multimedia and electronic publishing) (Primorac, 2008: 20-28). However, the role of the state with regards to cultural and as well creative industries, this field in the region of the SEE still remains crucial, as it remains the key player (i.e. funder) of these fragile industries.

Global influences - local responses

With their small-scale production and difficulties in distribution, cultural and creative industries in the region of Southeastern Europe are in a complex situation with regards to the global cultural and creative industries. It has to be mentioned that in the region of Southeastern Europe foreign cultural and creative industries have established themselves as dominant players. On the level of distribution one can

highlight the American film industry as one of the examples, although it had already been present in the past in one part of the region (namely, ex-Yugoslavia which was much more open to the influences from the West than other countries in the region – but still not to such an extent that can be perceived now). On the infrastructural level regarding the film industry, the number of multiplex and digital cinemas (European Audiovisual Observatory, 2012) is on the rise, while the ‘classical’ cinema theatres have been in decline in the last decade (Primorac, 2004: 65-66). Consequently on the content level, American production dominates.⁸ When it comes to other global media enterprises, the agencies of creative marketing, design and PR agencies have entered the region and have taken over a large portion of the market.⁹ It has to be mentioned that the domination of the US production and of the global media enterprises is not a peculiarity of this region in particular; this is an issue that is present in other (not so peripheral) parts of Europe as well. However, the impact in other countries occurs on the markets that are better regulated and have a longer tradition in these sectors.

As a further illustration for this imbalance between the global and the local production and consumption in this region, we consider the data on cultural export and import together with trade balance in 2008 as provided by UNCTAD *Creative Economy Report* (2008, 2010), and presented in *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends – Council of Europe/ERICarts* (2011).¹⁰ Their statistical data shows that the import of cultural goods and services in all the countries of the region is greater than export. Thus, this makes the trade balance negative for all the countries, where consequently Croatia has the largest negative trade balance (-550 million of USD in 2008 respectively)¹¹ while Slovenia is the only country with the positive trade balance. This shows to some extent that there is room for more participation on behalf of the audiences of cultural products and services, and that the local cultural production and markets could therefore be developed further.

This opens up the following questions: in what way can the local (cultural and creative) production in Southeastern Europe be supported and how can it be presented on the broader European and global markets? It is very important to approach such questions on the policy level so as to avoid entering into conflicting situations, as Breznik (2004: 50) pointed out using the example of the case of European audiovisual industries, where one can notice the divergence between the policies of the European Commission and the policies of the Council of Europe and of the European Parliament. On the one hand, selected EU public policies highlight the importance of strengthening large companies of European audiovisual industries so that they could be more influential on the European level and more importantly, on the global level. At the same time, the other set of EU public policies advocates the

protection of small-scale creative industries in order to resist global audiovisual industries as stressed by KEA (2006) and European Commission (2007) – a large part of which is European.¹² Here one has to take into account the big global players in the field of media, culture and entertainment coming from Europe, such as Vivendi, Universal Music Group, Pearson and Bertelsmann.¹³ However, one has to note that these same players are not an indicator of a European influence in this field regarding the type of content distributed through their channels, and of course to an even smaller extent of the content from SEE.

In this sense, it is important to keep in mind that the knowledge of the market structures is a significant factor in the relationship between the global and the local: it is not only the ownership over infrastructure that is important, but the ownership over the content that is distributed through these channels is relevant as well. In this way, the influences from the global cultural and creative industries are visible through the dominance of entertainment shows such as reality shows as well as different licensed shows of similar entertainment format.¹⁴ Moreover, the public service broadcasters have started to compete with commercial televisions using the discourse of commercial media, which is not only the case in Southeastern Europe, but on the European level as well. Such examples open up a discussion about the commercialization of the public media and the potential homogenization of the media space, but they also question the local redefinition of global models and the hybridization of the cultural formats. It has to be noted that in most of the countries of Southeastern Europe the new channels of commercial television that emerged in the last twenty years or so have partly contributed to the strengthening of domestic production, but primarily by initiating the production of entertainment shows, soap operas, and to a lesser extent drama. This enabled a growth of domestic production that is *twofold* – on the one hand, an original domestic production is developed, while on the other there is an emergence of the localization of global formats for a domestic market or a literal translation of these products. The production of the local creative industries in Southeastern Europe is therefore important because

the cultural industrialization of the region is inextricably related to social and political practices that remain discernible and oriented to local cultural identities and ways of life in spite of the growing transnational influences. The SEE cultural economy thus differs from the established patterns of economic globalization due to the specific role of local agents (Švob-Đokić, Primorac, Jurlin, 2008: 178).

Analyzing the successful examples of the local production of cultural and creative industries, one can notice that they follow the same patterns of global cultural and creative industries' successes. Inside the local cultural and creative industries the 'small replicas' of the global models are developed, as Breznik suggests (2005: 55): 'To define the local cultural industry in comparison with a global one, we would say that it is just like a global one only much smaller'. Furthermore, she suggests that on the local level, in this case the level of SEE region, monopolies are created that see the profit as their primary goal while the making of content of longer-standing cultural relevance is left to the smaller players on the (cultural) market. What is important is to develop policy mechanisms for strengthening these 'smaller players' as the 'local agents' that contribute to the diversification of the scene.

Obstacles for the development of cultural and creative industries

In order to adequately present the situation of cultural and creative industries in the region of Southeastern Europe one has to point out some of the unifying factors across the region, that hinder its development; the 'second modernity' phenomena that are still limited in the region. Firstly, one of the obstacles for the development of cultural and creative industries can be found in the fact that the general level of human capacities is weak. Also, the level of higher education has been weakened as Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić (2005: 136-138) stressed: 'Unfortunately, both the talent base and the quality of higher education in the Southeastern European region have significantly deteriorated in the period of post-socialist transition'. In addition, the 'brain drain' is still taking place - talented people are still leaving the countries of Southeastern Europe as indicated by WEF (2012).¹⁵ What is more, there is also the issue of 'brain waste' - the trend of scientists leaving positions in academia for better paid jobs in the private sector (Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić, 2005: 135). Thus, there is a general lack of professionals in the cultural and creative industries, i.e. there is a lack of cultural managers, a lack of professional education of the workers, but also a lack of understanding of the field (e.g. clients that are not informed of the work processes, etc.). These data indicate the importance of working on the education of all (future) stakeholders in this field – be it in cultural management, ICT for cultural and creative industries, and other. One also has to mention the related problem of the mobility of the artists from SEE that even now proves to be another complex issue, since the questions of visa regulations, tax policies, work and labour regulations present obstacles to artists (Vujadinović, 2008: 104). These issues still remain a problem although (or so to say because of) some of the countries of the region have become members of the European Union or are soon to be member states.

One of the problems preventing the strengthening of the export of cultural goods and services from this region is language: the 'small' languages of the region's countries limit a better development of symbolical production in the SEE. This issue is also present in other European countries and is not a specificity of this region; however, they function on the markets that are relatively better regulated and which have a longer tradition so they can remedy some of the problems. One of the solutions for the improvement of this situation can be found in some of the sectors of cultural and creative industries – such as the audiovisual industries and their practice of co-productions: for example, in the re-establishment of the cooperation between the countries of ex-Yugoslavia, and a development of those in the broader region.¹⁶ In this case, co-productions are an effective solution for audiovisual industries that have additional support in the policies of the European Union such as Eurimages and MEDIA (now under *Creative Europe* programme). Such solutions are not fully applicable to other fields, the first being, for example, the publishing industry. However, due to the lower costs of labour force some of the cultural and creative industries have become interesting to investors. For example, in film industry some of the SEE countries have become prime locations for high budget films and series,¹⁷ while in the publishing industry they have been used in the spheres of printing. This shows to be an interesting *dual* position of cultural and creative industries in the region – both as outsourcing and outsourced. This could serve as an illustration of the further elaboration on the aforementioned parallel processes of the first and the second modernity occurring simultaneously in the region.

In addition, the issues connected to intellectual property rights need to be highlighted in the context of the fast changing digital sphere in these countries.¹⁸ Previously completed research shows that 'cultural consumption and production in the SEE region have been executed partly on pirated software, while a certain proportion of cultural goods have been exchanged through the grey economy' (Primorac and Jurilin, 2008: 82). This comes as a result of difficulties on several levels – firstly, due to the lack of implementation of legal framework regarding these issues, secondly due to the shortage of availability and applicability of alternative models and licences for distributing such products and services, and thirdly due to the generally low purchasing power of citizens in countries of SEE. In the last decade citizens have been inclined to use software and cultural products distributed through 'illegal' channels and platforms as the prices of the legally distributed products were too high. It can be said that illegally distributed materials damaged specific cultural and creative industries, such as music and film and video industry, as well as software industry. Nevertheless, they opened up communication channels to a much larger number of participants, and thus its social influence was more significant than the

fragmentary financial losses that it produced for selected companies. Thus, it can be said that overregulation that is not adjusted to the digital age stifles creativity and its development (Lessig, 2004) and that it therefore has to be approached cautiously on a broad scale and thus in the countries of Southeastern Europe as well, where the situation of cultural and creative sectors is so volatile.

Taking into account the insecure (KEA 2006), Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2011), (self)exploitative (Ross 2008), that is, precarious position of the cultural workers in general; the position of cultural workers and artists in the SEE is even more volatile and insecure due to additional aspects. Not only that these work and employment positions are insecure as above-noted, but what is more, there are systemic insecurities as well. The conditions of protection and the sale of authors' work are highly insecure; this is partly due to inadequate legislature (or its inadequate implementation), which forced cultural workers to create modes of alternative protection of their creative work (Primorac, 2008: 26). Such cases illustrate the lack of understanding of the concept of authors' work and a disregard for the existing legal frameworks among the employed in the cultural and creative industries and beyond. However, it also points to the marginalization of creative labour as such, and the unsatisfactory situation of the cultural market in the respective countries. Although the conditions of those employed in cultural and creative industries are very diverse, taking into account the specific fields they are working in, one can highlight that there is a common denominator to these conditions which could be labelled as *double insecurity* (Primorac, 2008: 39). The first level represents the insecurity of work typical for cultural and creative industries (part-time work, short term contracts, etc.), while the second level of insecurity is connected to the characteristics of unstable transitional economies (irregular payments, breach of work contracts, etc.). Unfortunately, the positive sides of flexibility that are in Southeastern Europe are only applicable to the employer, while the workers themselves are experiencing only its negative sides. This opens up further questions on how to grapple with the dimension of insecurity within the overall precariousness of work and labour in the cultural and creative industries in general.

Future perspectives?

Southeastern Europe is a rather differentiated whole, with many diversities across the region, but what can be viewed from this macro level in-view into the situation is that the conditions for a further enhancement of the local cultural and creative industries are still not well developed. The notion of the necessity of the 'second modernity' phenomena as mentioned by Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić (2005) is still lacking. Local markets are mainly unorganized and are not connected, and the net-

working of cultural and creative programmes is minimal. Cultural and other public policies in this field are almost nonexistent; the models for development imported from outside of the region are present but are not attuned to the local situation.

Some of the issues that are not specific only to this region are evident: global cultural and creative industries dominate, and their influence is outlined through the direct placement of their cultural products, but also through the localization of global formats. Some of the local responses to these influences involve a direct connection to global markets through their cultural and creative production that is promoted via specific niches. The players that are not aspiring to the global market are focused on the local and regional level, where one part of them is reliant on the assistance of the state.

It can be said that, following a turbulent period, the region of Southeastern Europe entered a post-transitional phase in the cultural field as well. One can note the changes that involve a more intense communication with the global trends, which are primarily evident on the levels of cultural consumption, participation and cultural production. New spaces of cultural interaction are created and new cultural identities are being shaped – either through the private sector or the civil society initiatives. The region is moving from models of homogeneous national cultural identities towards models that put individual choices and participatory models in the focus, opening towards different cultures. However, the high impact of global cultural and creative industries on the one hand, and the weakness of the local stakeholders on the other hand, put into question this diversification.

Taking all this into account, one should advocate a need for a balancing act and for further development of cultural and other public policies in the countries belonging to Southeastern Europe. The latter particularly needs developing taking into account the symbolic value of culture, but it should also recognize the economic side of cultural and creative sectors without uncritically importing (economic) models that are not applicable to the local situation. An overall sustainable cultural development models need to be further developed on a country to country basis recognizing local specificities and creating local developmental models. Whether the policies towards cultural and creative industries will be included remains to be seen.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ In this article the region of Southeastern Europe (SEE) comprises of the following countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), Kosovo, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Slovenia, and Serbia. Since it is the youngest among the countries in question and because the data on Kosovo is rather scarce, it was not referred to it specifically in this article.
- ² Especially taking into account that four of the countries in question are already members of the European Union (Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania and Slovenia), three of them are candidate countries (FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia), three of them are potential candidate countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo), while Moldova is still taken in the status of 'other states'.
- ³ The former big distribution chains were dismantled and caused a heavy blow to these sectors: i.e. in publishing this was evident when Office for Book Distribution in Romania folded, SOFKNIGA in Bulgaria that had a wide distribution which was not easy to take over; while for example in film industry the drastic drop of cinema halls (two or three times the number) in the nineties in SEE was unprecedented (Primorac, 2008: 21-22).
- ⁴ This can be viewed after analysing country profiles at Compendium's interactive website – chapter on '4.2.3 Cultural/creative industries: policies and programmes' (Council of Europe/ERICarts, 2011, 2012, 2013).
- ⁵ A short overview of these initiatives by British Council is given in Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić (2005: 7), and in Primorac (2007: 58). Publications that prompted from these projects should be mentioned such as Jovičić and Mikić (2006), Jorgoni (2007), Zaman and Vasile (2010). Further work in the region was pursued in the following years as well (i.e. 2012-2013 cooperation with the Ministry of Culture of Macedonia to help develop the Macedonian creative economy sector; additional mapping exercises in Albania in 2013). UNESCO supported actions are of more recent date and of indirect nature; they are developed through the public call where the cultural industries are the key focus of the Fund. In the last two years six projects from the region were supported through the Fund (more available on: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/cultural-diversity/diversity-of-cultural-expressions/international-fund/> (accessed: 13/09/2013).
- ⁶ "In St Petersburg, "cultural industries" was an imported neologism profoundly disruptive of local understandings of "culture", and indeed, "industry". It represented a shift in policy terrain and caused bemusement and confusion; but it also represented a more visceral shift in the (self-) understanding of Russian culture and identity that often provoked defensives and hostility" (O'Connor, 2005: 45).
- ⁷ The field of 'Other business activities' is the major driver of creative industries' development in all the observed countries. In Croatia and Bulgaria the field with the highest increase is 'Recreational, sports and other activities', Jurin (2008: 131).
- ⁸ According to data from European Audiovisual Observatory (2012) 'estimated market share for European films in the EU climbed from 25.2% to 28.5% in 2011, back to the 'pre-3D' levels of 2007 and 2008. Market share for US films on the other hand fell from 68.5% to an estimated 61.4%. This would be lowest level since 2001'.
- ⁹ For example, companies such as McCann Erikson, BBDO, Ogilvy and Mather, or Grey Group Worldwide have to be mentioned as the dominant companies in the advertising sector.
- ¹⁰ COMPENDIUM of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe is a web-based and permanently updated information and monitoring system of national cultural policies in Europe. It is a long-term project which aims to include all 50 member states co-operating within the context of the European Cultural Convention. It is supported by the Council of Europe and managed by ERICarts Institute. More data available at: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/index.php> (accessed: 04/04/2014).
- ¹¹ For the year 2008, the trade balance for Albania amounted to -103 mil., for Bulgaria -379, Macedonia -71, Moldova -67 (2005), Romania -320, Slovenia +249, and Serbia -292 mil of USD (2007), as presented in the COMPENDIUM table 'Cultural imports, exports and trade balance (2000-2008)', Source: UNCTAD (2008, 2010), available at: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/statistics-markets.php?aid=112&cid=76&lid=en> (accessed, 04.04.2013). Unfortunately, there was no new cumulative

data available for these indicators at the time of writing of this article.

- ¹² Data from the European Audiovisual Observatory (2005) shows that out of 50 strongest companies in audiovisual industry 48.65% are American ones, 29.34% European and 14.84% Japanese, while the rest belongs to companies from other parts of the world.
- ¹³ In October 2012, the two latter companies entered talks on combining their publishing companies.
- ¹⁴ E.g. *Idol*, *The Farmer Wants a Wife*, *How Clean is Your House* (Freemantle Media); *Strictly Come Dancing* (BBC One); *Deal or No Deal*, *1vs100*, *Operation Triumph*, *Fear Factor*, *Big Brother* (Endemol Company), and many more.
- ¹⁵ For the countries of Southeastern Europe, the index of the 'Brain drain' diverges from 1.9 (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia), 2.1 (Albania, Moldova and Romania), 2.4 (Bulgaria and Croatia), 3.3 (Slovenia) to 3.6 (Montenegro) on the scale of 1-7 where (1) signifies that talented people leave the country, while (7) signifies that talented people stay in the country (WEF, 2012: 474).
- ¹⁶ E.g. *Grbavica* (Easma's Secret) (2006) and *Na putu* (On the Path) (2010) by Jasmila Žbanić, *Karaula* by Rajko Grlić (2006), to name a few.
- ¹⁷ E.g. Bulgarian NU Boyana Studio, Romanian Castel Film Studios and MediaPro Studios.
- ¹⁸ Until recently, the usage of new information and communication technologies was rather low in the region, but this has been changing rapidly in the last couple of years. According to Internet World Stats (2011, 2012), the rise of the Internet users in the last ten years has been exceptionally high: this was especially evident in Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2011 where the increase from 2001-2011 amounted to 51 900% and 20 485% respectively. When looking at the Internet penetration rate in 2012, some of the countries have less than 50% Internet user penetration (Albania (49%), Kosovo (20.5%), Moldova (44.8%) and Romania (44.1%), according to Internet World Stats (2012), while others are coming close to the European average of 63.2% (Like Bulgaria (51%), Macedonia (56.7%), Montenegro (50%), and Serbia (56.4%). Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina have the highest penetration rate (72.1%, 70.7% and 60%) respectively (Internet World Stats, 2012).

REFERENCES

- Beck, U. (2001) *Pronalaženje političkog. Prilog teoriji refleksivne modernizacije*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Beck, U. (2003) *Što je globalizacija?* Zagreb: Vizura.
- Benkler, Y. (2006) *The Wealth of Networks*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Bennet, T. & Frow, J (2008) *The SAGE Handbook of Cultural Analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Breznik, M. (2004) *Cultural Revisionism. Culture Between Neo-liberalism and Social Responsibility*. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
- Breznik, M. (2005) "Slovenian Publishing: Enigma of Local industry", 37-56. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed.: *The Emerging Creative Industries in Southeastern Europe*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.

- Council of Europe/ERICarts (2012) *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe, 11th edition [online]*. Available from: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net> [Accessed: 13 January 2013].
- Council of Europe/ERICarts (2011) *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe, 11th edition [online]*. Available from: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net> [Accessed: 10 February 2013].
- Cvjetičanin, B. and V. Katunarić, eds. (1998) *Kulturna politika Republike Hrvatske. Nacionalni izvještaj*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo kulture RH.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1990) *Reflections on the Revolution in Europe*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Dragičević-Šešić, M. and Dragojević, S. (2005) *Arts Management in Turbulent Times. Adaptable Quality Management*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation & Boekmanstudies.
- European Audiovisual Observatory (2005) *European Audiovisual Observatory Statistical Yearbook*. Strasbourg: European Audiovisual Observatory.
- European Audiovisual Observatory (2012) EU box office inches to record high in 2011 as European comedies provide welcome relief and 3D matures. Press Release Strasbourg, 14 May 2012 [online]. Available from: http://www.obs.coe.int/about/oea/pr/mif2012_cinema_pdf.pdf.en [Accessed: 13 January 2013].
- European Commission (2007) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Region on a European Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World [online]. Available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0242:FIN:EN:PDF> [Accessed: 9 March 2013].
- European Commission (2010) Unlocking the Potential of Cultural and Creative Industries [online]. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-policy-development/doc2577_en.htm [Accessed: 10 November 2010].
- European Commission (2011a) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Creative Europe – A New Framework Programme for the Cultural and Creative Sectors (2014-2020), Brussels, 23.11.2011, COM (2011) 786 final.
- European Commission (2011b) Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Establishing the Creative Europe Programme, Brussels, 23.11.2011, COM (2011) 785 final.
- European Commission (2011c) Creative Europe Programme. The Cultural and Creative Sectors Loan Guarantee Facility. Frequently Asked Questions [online].

- Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe/documents/faq-financial-instrument.pdf> [Accessed 13 April 2012].
- Gill, R. & Pratt, A. (2008) "In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 25(7-8), 1-30.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. and Baker, S. (2011) *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2008) "Cultural and Creative Industries", 552-569. In: T. Bennett & Frow, J (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Cultural Analysis*. London, Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Internet World Stats (2012) *Usage and Population Statistics* [online]. Available from: <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats4.htm> [Accessed: 12 January 2013].
- Internet World Stats (2011) *Usage and Population Statistics* [online]. Available from: <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats4.htm> [Accessed: 26 January 2010].
- Jenkins, H. (2006) *Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jorgoni, E. (2007) *Mapping of Creative Industries in Albania*. Tirana: British Council Albania. Available from: <http://www.britishcouncil.org/bc-albania-mapping.pdf> [Accessed: 20 February 2010].
- Jovičić, S. and Mikić, H. (2006) *Kreativne industrije. Preporuke za razvoj kreativnih industrija u Srbiji*. Beograd: British Council Serbia and Montenegro. Available from: http://www.britishcouncil.org/british_council_-_creative_industries-2.pdf [Accessed: 20 February 2010].
- Jurlin, K. (2008) "Kreativne djelatnosti – statistička analiza", 119-146. In: N. Švob-Đokić, et al.: *Kultura zaborava. Industrijalizacija kulturnih djelatnosti*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Kalanj, R. (1994) *Modernost i napredak. Studija/Modernity and Progress. A Study*. Zagreb: Antibarbarus.
- Kalanj, R. (1998) "Tranzicija, konsolidacija demokracije i pitanje kulture", 9-45. In: I. Cifrić, et al.: *Društveni razvoj i ekološka modernizacija. Prilozi sociologiji tranzicije*. Zagreb: HSD&Zavod za sociologiju FFZG.
- KEA (2006) *The Study on the Economy of Culture in Europe*. Brussels: The European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture.
- Krzysztofek, K. (1996) "The New Role of the Cultural Factor in the European Processes", 65-69. In: B. Cvjetičanin, ed.: *Dynamics of Communication and Cultural Change: The Role of Networks*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.
- Lessig, L. (2004) *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology and the Law to Lock Down Culture and Control Creativity*. New York: Penguin Press.

- Mayerhofer, E. and Mokre, M. (2007) "The Creative Industries in Austria: The Glories of the Past vs. The Uncertainties of the Present", 141-150. In: Lovink, G. and N. Rossiter, eds.: *My Creativity Reader: A Critique of Creative Industries*. Amsterdam: Institute for Network Cultures.
- McRobbie, A. (2002) "From Holloway to Hollywood: Happiness at Work in the New Cultural Economy?", 97-114. In: du Gay, P. and M. Pryke, eds.: *Cultural Economy. Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life*. London: Sage Publications.
- O'Connor, J. (2005) "Creative Exports. Taking Cultural Industries to St.Petersburg", *International Journal of Cultural Policies*, 11 (1), 45-60.
- O'Connor, J. (2010) *The Cultural and Creative Industries: A Literature Review. 2nd ed.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Creativity, Culture and Education (CCE).
- Obuljen, N. (2001) "Regional Cultural Co-operation: Croatian Position", 45-55. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed. *Redefining Cultural Identities: Southeastern Europe*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations,.
- Primorac, J. (2004) "Mapping the Position of Cultural Industries in Southeastern Europe", 59-78. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed.: *Cultural Transitions in Southeastern Europe*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.
- Primorac, J. (2007) "Attitudes of Cultural Workers towards Creative Industries Development and the City in Southeastern Europe", 55-65. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed.: *The Creative City: Crossing Visions and New Realities in the Region*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.
- Primorac, J. (2008) *The Position of Cultural Workers in Creative Industries. The South-East-European Perspective*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation [online]. Available from: <http://www.eurocult.org/uploads/docs/902.pdf> [Accessed: 6 February 2008].
- Primorac, J. and Jurlin, K. (2008) "Access, Piracy and Culture: The Implications of Digitalization in Southeastern Europe", 71-89. In: A. Uzelac and B. Cvjetičanin, ed.: *Digital Culture. The Changing Dynamics*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.
- Ross, A. (2007) "Nice Work if You Can Get It. The Mercurial Career of Creative Industries Policy", 17-39. In: Lovink, G. and N. Rossiter, eds.: *My Creativity Reader: A Critique of Creative Industries*. Amsterdam: Institute for Network Cultures.
- Ross, A. (2008) "The New Geography of Work: Power to the Precarious?", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 25(7-8), 31-49.
- Todorova, M. (1997) *Imagining the Balkans*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Tomić-Koludrović, I. and Petrić, M. (2005) "Creative Industries in Transition: Towards a Creative Economy", 7-23. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed.: *The Emerging Creative Industries in Southeastern Europe*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.
- Tomić-Koludrović, I. and Petrić, M. (2007) "Hrvatsko društvo – prije i tijekom tranzicije", *Društvena istraživanja*, Zagreb, 16, 4-5 (90-91), 867-889.
- Švob-Đokić, N. (2001) "Balkan versus Southeastern Europe", 35-41. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed.: *Redefining Cultural Identities: Southeastern Europe*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.
- Švob-Đokić, N. (2002) "On Cultural Industries in Southeastern Europe", *Culturelink*, Zagreb, 13(37), 113-142.
- Švob-Đokić, N. (2005) "Cultural Contexts in Transition Processes", 7-18. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed.: *Cultural Transitions in Southeastern Europe*. Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.
- Švob-Đokić, N. (2008) "Kontekst kulturne industrijalizacije", 21-46. In: N. Švob-Đokić et al.: *Kultura zaborava. Industrijalizacija kulturnih djelatnosti*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Švob-Đokić, N. Primorac, J. and Jurin K. (2008) "Southeastern Europe: Emergences and Developments", 178-184. In: H. Anheier and Y.I. Raj, eds.: *Cultural Economy. Cultures and Globalization Series*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.
- UNCTAD (2008) *Creative Economy Report 2008. The Challenges of Assessing the Creative Economy towards Informed Policy Making* [online]. Available from: http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/ditc20082cer_en.pdf [Accessed: 20 February 2010].
- UNCTAD (2010) *Creative Economy Report 2010. Creative Economy: A Feasible Development Option* [online]. Available from: http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/ditctab20103_en.pdf [Accessed: 20 July 2011].
- Virno, P. (2002) *Gramatika mnoštva*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Vujadinović, D., ed. (2008) *Mobility of Artists and Cultural Professionals in South Eastern Europe*. Beograd: Balkankult.
- WEF (2012) *The Global Competitiveness Report 2012-2012, World Economic Forum* [online]. Available from: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GlobalCompetitivenessReport_2012-13.pdf [Accessed: 13 January 2013].
- Zaman, G. and Vasile, V. (2010) "Cultural-Creative industries (CCI) – Economic and Social Performances", *The Annals of The "Ștefan cel Mare" University of Suceava. Fascicle of The Faculty of Economics and Public Administration*, 10, 63-77.
- Županov, J. (2002) *Od komunističkog pakla do divljeg kapitalizma*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

Položaj i perspektive kulturnih i kreativnih industrija u Jugoistočnoj Europi

Jaka Primorac

SAŽETAK

U članku se analizira trenutačni položaj i perspektive kulturnih i kreativnih industrija u Jugoistočnoj Europi u kontekstu razvoja javnih politika. Propozicija da je regija Jugoistočne Europe ušla u posttranzicijsku fazu koja uključuje otvaranje regije i stvaranje novih kulturnih identiteta testirana je kroz *desk research* analizu dostupnih inistraživačkih studija, izvještaja i sekundarnih podataka o kulturnim i kreativnim industrijama u Jugoistočnoj Europi. Paralelno uz pregled uvezenih modela kulturnih i kreativnih industrija pružen je i uvid u utjecaj globalnih kulturnih i kreativnih industrija na lokalnu proizvodnju i distribuciju kako na infrastrukturnoj tako i na sadržajnoj razini. U članku je istaknut i nedostatak kulturnih i ostalih javnih politika u polju kulturnih i kreativnih industrija diljem JIE regije, te je pokazano da ukoliko su prisutne nisu prilagođene lokalnim uvjetima. Potom je pružena analiza faktora koji na makro razini sprječavaju razvoj kulturnih i kreativnih industrija s naglaskom na prepreke na razini kako kulturne, tako i informacijsko-komunikacijske infrastrukture, razine obrazovanja, kao i na nesigurnosti rada i zaposlenosti. U članku se pokazuje da je situacija u regiji vrlo raznolika, kao i da su uvjeti za daljnje poboljšanje kulturnih i kreativnih industrija nedovoljno razvijeni. Uzevši u obzir heterogenu situaciju diljem JIE regije, u članku se zaključuje kako su nužne lokalno-utemeljene javne politike za kulturne i kreativne industrije koje će biti stvorene unutar okvira strategija za održivi kulturni razvoj.

Ključne riječi: javne politike, Jugoistočna Europa (JIE), kreativne industrije, kreativni rad, kulturne industrije, kulturne politike, kulturna tranzicija.